

That includes former South African President Nelson Mandela, who has been erroneously portrayed as opposing this bill.

I think it is paternalistic to assert that African nations do not understand the effects this bill would have on them. And I do not believe that these nations have unrealistic expectations of its potential benefits.

Africans widely view their interaction with the outside world as one that has been anything from exploitative at worst to unequal at best. From the time of the first penetration of the African interior by slavers and ivory hunters until today, that has been the case—regardless of intent. Even benevolent missions were viewed as unintentional but nonetheless effective entrees for colonial powers' exploitation of the continent.

Interestingly, our own foreign assistance to the continent—which is viewed as a product of goodwill and of shared goals with reformers—does not escape that stigma.

As with any donor/recipient relationship, the recipient will always be viewed as "less equal" than the donor. That fact is unavoidable and, indeed, universal.

Although cash-strapped and desperately needy, Africans rightfully view a purely donor/recipient relationship between us and them as another manifestation of the treatment of Africans as less than equal—again, that is regardless of intent.

This legislation is clearly viewed differently by Africans, and that's why I am puzzled and unimpressed with the accusations by opponents of this effort that it is "exploitative." That somehow American corporations are simply going to reinvent that age-old relationship of Africa to the world and this will be their vehicle to do so. This effort is about realizing opportunities to build new mutually beneficial ties between the United States and Africa.

That is the Africans' view, at least. And that is why they bristle at the idea that this effort is not in their best interest, that they must be protected from something which they see as beneficial and positive.

In effect, it says to them that they must be protected from beginning to build relationships with America where they can be equals, where they are not simply something to pity and to patronize.

This bill will not change that attitude nor the continent overnight. As I said earlier, it is neither comprehensive trade legislation for Africa, nor is it a comprehensive policy toward Africa. It is a beginning, though. An important beginning. And, despite its potential flaws, it is critically important to pass this bill if we ever want to help bring Africa away from the margins, away from the suffering and human and environmental disasters and into the fold of developed and free nations.

That effort will require American leadership, and that leadership requires

a first step. This effort is just such a first step, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support it and to defend it from those who would kill it, obstruct it or otherwise defeat it, either out of protectionist or other outmoded sentiments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. The Senator from Delaware has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the substitute amendment to Calendar No. 215, H.R. 434, an act to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa.

Trent Lott, Bill Roth, Mike DeWine, Rod Grams, Mitch McConnell, Judd Gregg, Larry E. Craig, Chuck Hagel, Chuck Grassley, Pete Domenici, Don Nickles, Connie Mack, Paul Coverdell, Phil Gramm, R.F. Bennett, and Richard G. Lugar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 2325 to H.R. 434, an act to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa, shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are required under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) would vote "yes."

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 45, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 342 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Abraham	Enzi	Kyl
Allard	Fitzgerald	Lott
Ashcroft	Frist	Lugar
Bennett	Gorton	Mack
Bond	Gramm	McConnell
Brownback	Grams	Murkowski
Burns	Grassley	Nickles
Cochran	Gregg	Roberts
Coverdell	Hagel	Roth
Craig	Hutchinson	Santorum
Crapo	Hutchison	Sessions
DeWine	Inhofe	Shelby
Domenici	Jeffords	Smith (OR)

Specter	Thomas	Voinovich
Stevens	Thompson	Warner

NAYS—46

Akaka	Edwards	Moynihan
Baucus	Feingold	Murray
Bayh	Feinstein	Reed
Biden	Graham	Reid
Bingaman	Harkin	Robb
Breaux	Hollings	Rockefeller
Bryan	Johnson	Sarbanes
Bunning	Kerrey	Schumer
Byrd	Kerry	Smith (NH)
Campbell	Kohl	Snowe
Cleland	Landrieu	Thurmond
Collins	Leahy	Torricelli
Conrad	Levin	Wellstone
Daschle	Lieberman	Wyden
Dodd	Lincoln	
Durbin	Mikulski	

NOT VOTING—8

Boxer	Helms	Lautenberg
Dorgan	Inouye	McCain
Hatch	Kennedy	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 45, the nays 46. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, may we have order. The chairman is about to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please come to order.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—D.C./LABOR-HHS APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that today at a time determined by the majority leader, after consultation with the Democratic leader, the Senate begin consideration of the conference report to accompany the D.C./Labor-HHS Appropriations bill and the conference report be considered read. I further ask consent that on Monday, November 1, the Senate resume consideration of the conference report. I finally ask consent that at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, November 2, the Senate proceed to consider the conference report and that there be 30 minutes equally divided between the two leaders, to be followed by a vote on the adoption of the conference report, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, in light of this agreement, there will be no further votes today. The Senate will continue debate on the CBI/African trade bill and may begin consideration of the conference report to accompany the D.C./Labor-HHS bill.

AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT—continued

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I will make a few comments because I have

to say the vote just taken represents a sad day for America because it gives the wrong signal both to our people here at home and to those who were looking forward to this legislation as a means of beginning their country on a road of success and development.

I have to say there is something wrong with the way this Senate operates when a majority on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, are in support of these significant treaties.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Will the revered chairman yield for a question?

Mr. ROTH. Yes.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Would he not estimate there are 75 votes for this measure in the Senate?

Mr. ROTH. Absolutely, I say to my distinguished friend, at least 75.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. At least 75.

Mr. ROTH. At least 75.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. And here we are.

Mr. ROTH. What kind of signal are we giving to the rest of the world? People are talking about isolationism. What does this vote represent? Does it mean we can't act effectively when the welfare of thousands of people both here and abroad is at stake? I say to my distinguished colleague and ranking member of the Finance Committee, for whom I have the greatest respect, that we will not consider this to be a dead issue.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. No.

Mr. ROTH. We shall continue to fight and assure that the opportunity arises for this Senate to take appropriate action, to have the opportunity to vote on this important matter. I lament we have spent more than a week of debate on this bill. We are ready to deal with the subject matter of this bill and relevant amendments. The vote, to be candid, is a victory for the few who oppose the bill and a vote against the interests of American workers who would benefit from this bill.

I regret it, as I said before, because this vote blocks progress—progress by the House, which passed this bill with a strong bipartisan majority. This vote blocks progress by the President, and this was one of his most important initiatives. This vote blocks progress by the Senate, which I know enjoys the support of strong majorities, as I have already said, on both sides of the aisle. Most importantly, this vote blocks progress that would mean new markets. I can't emphasize that too much. It would mean new markets for the American textile industry. It creates approximately 121,000 new jobs. It would have meant roughly \$8.8 billion in enhanced business for the industry.

I deeply regret the effort to say this is just the result of campaign contributions, or whatever. Nothing could be further from the truth. I don't know whether or not we have upstairs now the Ambassadors of the 47 countries in Africa who would have benefited. They have been here day in and day out watching the developments; they are concerned about this legislation, which

held out promise and hopes for them. As I said, this legislation is critically important because it promised jobs here at home. It promised the opportunity for the textile industry to better keep competitive in the local market. But not only here, I say to my distinguished friend from New York, isn't it true it would also help develop markets abroad?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. That do not now exist.

Mr. ROTH. That do not now exist. Exactly.

So that, as I say, this is a sad day for the country, and it is a sad for Delaware as well.

Let me say to the American workers, to our friends abroad, and our many supporters in the Senate gallery—I think I can include Senator MOYNIHAN—that I will continue to fight for this bill.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROTH. Senator MOYNIHAN and I will continue to fight for the benefits of this bill that extends to American workers and American industry. We will continue to resist the instincts of some who have fought to maintain protective walls and isolate America from the outside world.

The thing that bothers me so much is that in addition to the negative impact it has on this industry and on American workers, it sends the wrong signal just as we are on the verge of a multilateral meeting in Seattle—a historic occasion that would enable us to provide the kind of leadership that is needed if we are to continue the direction of liberal trade policy.

Yesterday, Senator MOYNIHAN pointed out so eloquently how liberal trade policies from way back in the 1930s have benefited this country, have benefited American workers, and, indeed, have benefited the entire world. We cannot turn our backs on this record.

We shall continue to fight and seek the opportunity to move forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, there are more than just prospective benefits for American workers in this legislation, on this Trade and Development Act of 1999. We now have 7 days before the Trade Adjustment Assistance program is ended, a program that goes back 37 years to the Trade Expansion Act that President Kennedy obtained in his first term—the only real measure he did in his first term—37 years and as many Presidents as you can count, with 200,000 persons and their families eligible for benefits. The funding ends on Friday.

More than that, we have put in jeopardy this morning—and it remains in jeopardy—trade policies of the last two-thirds of a century. In that two-thirds of a century, we have seen America rise to unknown and previously inconceivable levels of economic growth and stability.

This very morning the press reports, I will read from the New York Times:

Headline: "Strong summer is likely to propel the economic boom to a record." The story: "The American economy turned in its best quarterly performance of the year this summer, virtually guaranteeing enough momentum to carry the nation to its longest economic expansion in history early next year."

By February—that is not very long—we shall have had the longest expansion in the history of the Nation.

Sir, I want to stand alongside my chairman and say this is not over. It cannot be over.

Do we have any idea what is at stake? Can you imagine going to Seattle having denied the President—not this President, whoever, the next President—having denied the Executive the power to negotiate trade agreements at the Seattle Round—as it could be commonly called—and the fast track is not in the President's court?

And then the matter that we took up today. It is a great effort on sub-Saharan Africa. We had the President of Nigeria here yesterday. We have had ambassadors from all over sub-Saharan Africa. The Caribbean Basin Initiative, President Reagan's initiative, sir—the new benefits that we ought to put in place—are gone. The representatives of at last democratic regimes in Central America came up, sir, at your invitation—gone. Trade Adjustment Assistance is gone. The Generalized System of Preferences—how old is that? A quarter of a century of the Generalized System of Preferences is gone, empty-handed.

The chairman and I were planning to spend a few days in Seattle just meeting with people. We were not going to speak. Dare we go? I suppose Ambassador Barshefsky is required to go. I don't want to show my face. But that need not be. We are still in session. The bill is still on the calendar.

Let us hope what we have done this weekend we can move to change it, and move on as we were moving.

I thank you, sir. No one could lead it better than the chairman did—events over which he has no control. The tangle we can get into with people who sometimes think one issue is more important than others.

We have to rise to this, sir. I hope we will.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ROTH. I thank the Senator for the gracious remarks. I assure him I will work closely with him to make certain this matter is acted upon by this Senate.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I hope—from the exchange we have just witnessed—that the two wise men will take their trip to Seattle without government gifts. But as they say, the fight will continue.

I am not at all sanguine about the recent vote. Be that as it may, it was a majority vote.

The Senator from Delaware says he knows—rather he estimated, estimated. The bipartisan majority has just stated what they would like to do, and that is to discuss this further because we are reading in the morning paper exactly what is going on. You know and I know what is going on in this country. The money boys have taken over.

For the distinguished Presiding Officer, mark it down. The money boys said this Christian right fundamentalist crowd, Gary Bauer, be gone. Mr. Buchanan, with your abortion, be gone. The rest of you with your fundamentalist stuff, be gone. We have taken over the party, and we are putting \$60 million in with George Bush, and the selection process is over. They don't even have to attend the debates. That is what is expected in politics. Otherwise, they have a good friend in the White House—the soft money President, and he is on the money side. I had to fight him with NAFTA. And I am fighting him now, and I will continue to fight and to speak for jobs.

Don't give me anything about jobs. How can they talk? It ought to be ashes in their mouths.

Since they passed NAFTA promising 200,000 jobs, the textile industry alone has lost 420,000. We know about their promises. We put it in the RECORD. ATMI, and everybody else who said they wouldn't move, they all moved. They have to move. We are the ones who have caused the problem. We put in clean air, clean water, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, plant closing notices, parental leave, and safe machinery. Before you open up your manufacturing you have to comply with the high standard of American living, bipartisan agreement on both sides. Instead, now you can go down to Mexico for 58 cents. Maybe it is up to one dollar in some places. And you don't have to have any of those requirements. If the competition leaves, other companies have to leave to stay in business.

They say: Let's spread it to the African nations; we have the ambassadors in town. I have been in Africa. Don't tell me about sympathy for Africa. I lost friends in North Africa during the War who were helping to bring freedom there. We finally helped Mandela get out of prison. We have been the friends of Africa. We traveled there and we helped.

If we have so much to give, why don't the other industries give to Africa? The textile industry has given at the store, so to speak. Now we have lost two-thirds of our industry. We have a competitive one-third left, but it is going away. That is why I stand here.

It is a dark day. I am reminded of Jesse Jackson, who said keep hope alive. We still have hope as long as we can get the attention of a majority of Republicans and Democrats. Several Republican friends came over and said: I agree with you; I'm going to vote with you. Look at the record. I don't know how many Republicans, but it

was a bipartisan vote. They are embarrassed with the Farley escapade. It is a one-way street.

Come on, trade is trade. Don't give me this whine and fail stuff.

We need not just a new agricultural assistance over there with the special Trade Representative. We need Nancy Reagan to replace Barshefsky—"Just say no." That is what we need. We know how to bargain. This is not foreign trade; this is foreign aid. It was good for 50 years to revive the different economies of the world, but it isn't any longer. We are in trouble. This boom they are talking about in the stock market is the information society; it doesn't create the jobs. Farley has already transferred nearly as many jobs offshore as Bill Gates has created with Microsoft. The Time magazine article says Microsoft has created 22,000 jobs. We already shipped off, job-wise, Microsoft. We have gotten rid of it, and we want to give them a \$50 million prize for doing it, according to the Washington Post this morning.

Talk about a dark day. Maybe someday we will simmer down in this body and forget about the Presidential election and act like Senators—work on the minimum wage, health care, the Patients' Bill of Rights, bankruptcy bill, and other bills we have been trying to bring up.

My caucus is meeting now. I know I belong in there to try to protect my rights, but I will object to anything other than the regular order of business. Regular order is my vote. We can keep on moving. Let them vote against the minimum wage. They couldn't care less about the workers; they just want the vote. It is all politics. It is all appeasement, as Will Rogers said.

We cannot break the syndrome around here. The media is just pell-mell and fancy-free with the politicians. We got a break this morning. I bless whoever wrote that story and the one in Time magazine because I have been alone in this situation.

I am tired of this berating, when we are trying to do the work of the voters and the middle class people of America—the economic strength of this democracy—and the money guys are trying get rid of the middle class. Money is taking over the Republican Party, and now money is taking over the Democratic Party. That is what it is. It is just money. That is all.

When we started the leadership council—that crowd, our own friends—I remember it well, it was after the 1984 race. We got together all of the southern Senators, save one. We found out that the trouble was we had too many caucuses. We had the NAACP, the AFL-CIO, the women's caucus, this rights caucus and that rights caucus. So their solution was to form a caucus. They had the arrogance to call them the leadership council. They talked at the caucus yesterday, everybody bowing and scraping. They said: HOLLINGS, you got out of the Presidential race, but you head it up. I said I can't in

good faith ask the Democratic Party to be there for me and then, when I get beat, say the trouble is with the party, not me. I supported Paul Kirk, and we worked and stayed in the party.

I have never been to a meeting in the leadership thing. I watched the money take over. A lot of what Buchanan said about the parties is right, there is not a dime's worth of difference. You can't get anything here for working America. It is money, money, money. They ought to be ashamed to say I am continuing to fight for this. It would shame me with those contributions.

I was looking for the distinguished leader, and I was going to tell him confidentially as a friend: Let the bill die; you don't want to bring it up. I have done you a favor.

We were headed with a symbol to the world. I am worried about the country. Don't give me symbols about Seattle and ambassadors in the gallery. We should stay here to do our work. They can make any agreement, but it had better not be unanimous because I object. I expect the regular order.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. I don't intend to get involved in the debate involving the merits of this bill, but the problem with this legislation is not the legislation itself; the problem is the majority has not allowed the minority, the Republicans have not allowed the Democrats, to treat this bill as the Senate should treat any bill.

We started this bill last Thursday. It is now Friday. Eight days we have spent on this legislation. We have spent no time on a single amendment on this legislation.

The proper way to handle this is to allow the Senator from South Carolina, the Senator from Minnesota, and others to bring their amendments forward and have a debate. The Senators who want to offer amendments have all agreed to time agreements. The Senator from South Carolina desired 10 minutes on an amendment, 5 minutes per side.

Our leader, the minority leader, has also agreed, even though it is probably not in his best interest, but he believes in this legislation. He knows how important it is to the President. He has said he will offer to go along with the majority leader and table amendments not germane.

We should treat this body as it has been treated for over two hundred years: Bring a measure before the floor and let the debate proceed. We would have completed this legislation some time ago. There is no question this legislation now before this body has at least 75 supporters, maybe 80. I think this should give the majority all the backing they need for this legislation. I think it is a shame we are to the point we have not had a good debate on this legislation; in fact, probably the legislation will be pulled down. That is too bad.

We as the minority will have to continue protecting our rights, whether it is the CBI, this bill now before us, whether it is bankruptcy. Whatever the legislation that is going to be brought forward, we must have our input. That is all we are asking. We are not asking we win every amendment. Some amendments we recognize the majority does not want to vote upon. But that is not the way you conduct a legislative body, just avoid all issues that are tough votes.

We need more tough votes. We would all be better off, individually, in our respective States and the country, if we had more tough votes.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRIST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ARMENIA

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to express my regret over the tragic situation in Armenia. As we all know, a few days ago gunmen broke into their Parliament and killed the Prime Minister and several other officials of the Armenian Government. Later today Senator ABRAHAM will introduce a resolution which will express our condolences to the people of Armenia and our expression of support for their continued struggle to create a viable and strong democratic tradition in their country.

As I said, late yesterday afternoon in Yerevan, the capital of Armenia, several gunmen broke into their Parliament and killed eight Government officials and wounded seven others. They then held hostages for 24 hours, and only after the intercession of the President of Armenia in negotiations did they relent, release the hostages, and then surrender to the authorities.

Among those killed were Prime Minister Vazgen Sarkisian, Parliament speaker Karen Demirchian, deputy speakers Yuri Bakhshian and Ruben Miroian, Energy Minister Leonard Petrosian, senior economic official Mikhail Kotanian and lawmakers Genrikh Abramian and Armenak Armenakian. These gentlemen gave their lives as they were pursuing a democratic future for the people of Armenia.

It appears the gunmen were not part of any larger conspiracy. They were family members who were bent on a path of individual retribution and revenge. But the tragic incident reminds us of the fragility of constitutional government and democracy around the world, particularly in Armenia.

Armenia declared its independence in September of 1991. It has been struggling to ensure a free and fair electoral

process. Today, Armenians continue to be determined to ensure democracy will be the rule in their country. I had the occasion to travel there two years ago.

We all know one of the great points of friction in the area is the area of Nagorno-Karabakh, an ethnically Armenian territory which was controlled for years by Azerbaijan. Recently, we have seen progress. Indeed, the Prime Minister was one of the key figures in forging a dialogue between the Government of Azerbaijan and the Government of Armenia. His tragic loss, I hope, is not a setback for that process.

Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott had just left Armenia in his efforts to try to prompt further discussions between Azerbaijan and Armenia. He has now returned there to ensure it is clear to the Government and people of Armenia that America will stand with them.

Today is an opportunity to send our message of support, our message of condolence; also, our message of further support for the people of Armenia as they confront the challenges of democracy.

I join my colleague, Senator ABRAHAM, and others supporting this legislation to, once again, signal to the world and the people of Armenia that we stand with them in this time of tragedy, and will in the future on more hopeful days.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the conference report to accompany the D.C. Labor-HHS appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be stated.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

The committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill, H.R. 3064, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of October 27, 1999.)

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I want to talk a little bit about the bill as a whole. There is going to be a joint effort between two subcommittees on the Appropriations Committee—my subcommittee, the D.C. appropriations subcommittee, on which Senator DURBIN is the ranking member, and then the Labor-HHS spending bill, which has Senator SPECTER as the chairman and Senator HARKIN as the ranking mem-

ber. In addition, this bill contains the 1-percent across-the-board spending cut that is necessary for us to come into our budget caps and save the Social Security surplus intact.

First, I want to talk about the bigger bill because I think we should understand this is a very important achievement that we will make if Congress passes this bill and sends it to the President.

This bill marks, for the first time in 30 years, that we will pass all of our spending bills, and there will be no raid on the Social Security trust funds. The Social Security trust funds will be left intact so that people who have paid in will get back not only what they have paid in, but they will be given Social Security benefits after they are eligible. No longer will we dip into the Nation's retirement fund to pay for today's spending needs. This is a significant achievement.

For the record, this bill will be voted on on Tuesday. We will debate today and Monday. On Tuesday, I hope we will send this bill to the President, and I hope the President will sign it.

Some have complained about the across-the-board spending cuts. I think we can afford one penny of savings on every dollar to preserve the retirement needs of America. I do not think that is too much to ask of this Congress. After all, there is a little waste in Federal Government.

The inspectors general within the Departments across Government have already identified \$16 billion in funds that have been misspent. The Governmental Affairs Committee, working with the General Accounting Office, has identified nearly \$200 billion in savings in Federal overpayments, erroneous payments, and wasteful practices.

With this waste, I believe we can take a 1-percent cut to preserve the integrity of Social Security to cover the programs that are worthy and use our taxpayer dollars more efficiently. With \$216 billion in waste, we can cover the programs that need to be covered if our administrators have any integrity and if they are, in fact, competent. I hope they are. I do not think it is too much to ask. After all, when any family sees it is not going to meet its income and its spending needs, what does it do? It does not just spend anyway. Hopefully, it does not borrow. It sits down and determines where it can cut. I wager most families in America have had to make more than a 1-percent cut in their budgets when they have run into an emergency and do not have the funds to spend.

I now turn to the provisions in the District of Columbia portion of this bill. This is our second attempt to get a District of Columbia funding bill the President will sign. I believe we have reached a solution that is acceptable to all the relevant parties.

Senator DURBIN has been very productive; he has been responsible; he has been a real player in this process. In